

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/088,094
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 14, 2003
Reply to the Office Action of May 9, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 4 remain pending in the present application. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

Objections to the Specification

As requested in the Office Action, the specification was amended to make the correct references to Figs. 2(a) and 2(b) (instead of just "Fig. 2"), as well as to Figs. 3(a) and 3(b) (instead of just "Fig. 3").

The Drawings

As requested in the Office Action, Figs. 3(a) and 3(b) are labeled as "PRIOR ART."

Claim Objections

As requested in the Office Action, the claims were amended to overcome minor informalities.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over **Swanson et al.** (USP 4,469,993). It is submitted that nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests all of the features recited in the present claimed invention.

For instance, one feature of the present invention is the ability to preserve the maximum value for the speed data and the minimum resolution of the speed data (*i.e.*, without changing them), when the user is given the ability to specify various speed pattern preparation cycles. For instance, amended independent claim 1 recites "specifying a speed pattern preparation cycle by user *without changing* a maximum value of the speed data and a minimum resolution of the speed data." Dependent claim 2 recites a related feature for "selecting a combination of the maximum value and the minimum resolution of the speed data by the user." Amended independent claim 4 recites "a speed pattern preparation cycle unit inputting a speed pattern preparation cycle specified by a user without changing a maximum value of speed data and a minimum resolution of the speed data." The cited prior art does not teach or suggest at least these claimed features.

The Office Action referred to col. 3, lines 16-31 and col. 8, lines 42-60 of **Swanson et al.** for allegedly disclosing these features (as these features relate to the original language recited in the claims). However, the cited portions of **Swanson et al.** do not support the Examiner's rejection of the corresponding claimed features. Basically, these portions of **Swanson et al.** merely describe the variability of velocity position profile and the ability to adjust the velocity control. Such teachings do not relate to a maximum value and a minimum resolution of the speed data. The ability to adjust velocity control has nothing to do with maintaining any maximum value or minimum resolution of speed data. **Swanson et al.** is silent with regard to specifying a speed pattern preparation cycle by a user, "without changing a maximum value of the speed data and a minimum resolution of the speed

data." For at least these reasons, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Swanson et al.**, in view of **Busujima** (USP 4,968,923). The Office Action made the further reference to **Busujima** for allegedly disclosing the shifting of a decimal part of the speed data right or left. For this feature, the Examiner referred to col. 5, lines 35-40 of **Busujima** for rounding up the decimal part of speed data.

However, rounding up a decimal part is different than shifting a decimal part right or left. In particular, when rounding up a decimal value to the nearest integer, the integer value is changed and the decimal part is truncated. This is completely different than shifting a decimal part of the speed data right or left.

Moreover, the disclosure in **Busujima** for rounding up a decimal part of a value has nothing to do with preventing any maximum value and any minimum resolution of speed data from being changed, as specifically recited in claim 3. As can be seen in a comparison between Figs. 2(a) and 3(a), as well as a comparison between Figs. 2(b) and 3(b), the conventional art suffers through a deficiency of fixed values for the maximum speed data and minimum resolution of speed data, whereas the present invention preserves a maximum value and minimum resolution of the speed data by shifting the decimal part of the speed data when the user specifies or changes the speed pattern

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/088,094
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 11, 2003
Reply to the Office Action of May 9, 2003

preparation cycle. For at least these various reasons, the present claimed invention of claim 3 patentably distinguishes over prior art, either alone or in combination.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/088,094
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 11, 2003
Reply to the Office Action of May 9, 2003

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, the pending claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested. If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP



John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,054

JPK/kal
Atty. Docket No. 020312
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

Customer Number
23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Replacement and Annotated Sheets of Drawing (Figs.3(a) and 3(b))
H:\HOME\JPK\Prosecution\020312\Filings\1.111 Amendment - August 2003